

thority which has been assumed by the NLRB.

The owners of a business have a right to liquidate their company, provided it is a bona fide closing and does not disturb the public welfare materially. Going out of business, as well as going into business, is a basic element in a free enterprise system.

Equally important is the threat that the NLRB decision presents to the principles of corporate liability. In determining that a single employer was involved, the NLRB lumped together numerous companies which were related to Deering Milliken as sales agent. While these companies were owned in varying degrees by the same interests that owned Darlington, they also had hundreds of other stockholders who had no interest in Darlington or in one another. All were held liable.

If the Supreme Court should hold one corporation liable for the debts of another simply because there is an identity of stockholders, it would be a devastating blow to the corporate form of business enterprise. It would mean that a corporation could never be sure about its real financial obligations because it could not know the complete holdings of its stockholders. Without the corporate form of business with its limited liability, it would be impossible to raise the capital necessary to keep the Nation moving forward and to provide jobs for our ever-growing population.

CORRECTION OF A VOTE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, last evening when the vote was taken on final passage of the then pending bill, S. 2642, I voted "nay" when my name was called.

I find this morning, on reading the RECORD, that I am recorded as having voted for the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD may be corrected accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made accordingly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The change in the RECORD cannot affect the outcome but that change in the RECORD will reflect the truth. I believe that the truth should be reflected.

I answered from the rear of the Chamber when my name was called. There was noise and confusion because Senators were voting and quickly departing for their homes, since it had been announced that there would be no further business transacted after the final vote on the pending measure. I voted and immediately left the Chamber for home. I did not remain for the recapitulation. Had I done so, I might have detected the error and it could have been corrected at that time. But it did not come to my attention until this morning. I am sure that such an error was made by the clerk not because of his inattention, but because of the noise and confusion that prevailed in the Chamber at the time.

I therefore request that the RECORD be corrected to reflect the truth.

THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in regard to the international crisis that confronts not only the United States, but also the world, in respect to the war activities

which are being conducted in South Vietnam. The United States, in my judgment, is clearly one of the aggressor nations in southeast Asia.

Yesterday, at his press conference, President de Gaulle suggested that the problems of southeast Asia should be settled in a conference by the United States, France, Russia, and Red China.

It would be better to try to go to such a conference table than to be making war, as the United States is doing at the present hour in southeast Asia, in clear violation of our Constitution, article I, section 8, and in violation of our treaty obligations under both the United Nations and SEATO.

However I am a little at a loss to understand why the United States, France, Russia, and Red China should assume that they have the prerogative and right to settle the crisis in southeast Asia for the rest of the world.

I repeat what I have said for many weeks. The countries that participated in the Geneva accords of 1954, which accords quartered Indochina into Laos, North Vietnam, Cambodia, and South Vietnam, ought to go back to the conference table. Those countries owe it to the United Nations to try peaceful methods for settling the views that have given rise to a threat to peace. That would be an appropriate approach under and within the framework of the United Nations.

Likewise, it would be perfectly proper as a regional alliance, which is permissible under the United Nations, for the SEATO to seek to go to the conference table with respect to the crisis in southeast Asia.

If such approaches are not acceptable then it seems to me that the dispute ought to go to the Security Council of the United Nations. If vetoed by Russia, or any other country in the Security Council it ought to then go to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

One thing is certainly clear. The issue ought to go to an international conference for an attempt at peaceful settlement. The issue ought to be taken off the bloody battlefields of southeast Asia.

Mr. President, this is a growing crisis. It is a crisis which is much more serious today than it was a week ago. It is a crisis which is much more serious today than it was 72 hours ago. There is no doubt that war is now waged in North Vietnam. There is no doubt that South Vietnamese forces have dropped paratroopers into North Vietnam. I am satisfied that the borders of North Vietnam have been transgressed. I am satisfied that war activities are being conducted in North Vietnam.

No one in the U.S. Government has been able, up to this hour, to lay any evidence before the Committee on Foreign Relations that he has been able to find military forces of North Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, or China in South Vietnam. They may be there. But if they are there, they are obviously there in such small numbers that their presence has not been proved.

One of our military stooges, within the South Vietnamese military government,

alleged a couple of days ago that there were North Vietnamese soldiers in South Vietnam. But that statement is now retracted. When called upon by our officials over there for the proof, they could not offer the proof. The sad thing is that the United States is guilty at this hour, in my judgment, of fighting a war in North Vietnam through military stooges of South Vietnam.

I am very glad to note in this morning's press that our Ambassador, General Taylor, has made very clear to the military dictator of South Vietnam, General Khanh, our disapproval of at least the public announcements of a plan to go north, because going north means going to war.

In my judgment, we cannot run the risk of a major war in Asia until we have at least fulfilled our clear commitments under the United Nations Charter and our clear commitments under SEATO, with respect to which we now stand in undeniable violation before the world.

I have been serving for the past several days as a Senate aid, along with Senator HICKENLOOPER, at the Conference of Foreign Ministers at the Pan American Building. When I finish this speech, I shall return to that assignment. Talking, as I have in the past several days, with foreign ministers from countries to the south of us, one soon recognizes the great concern that exists in South America over the U.S. action in Asia. That concern exists around the world. Our best friends are at a loss to understand why the United Nations is pursuing unilateral military action in South Vietnam which constitutes an act of war, without a declaration of war, without keeping our obligation to go to the United Nations or to SEATO. We are opposing reconvening the 14-nation Geneva Conference in an effort to try to settle by peaceful procedures the threat to the peace of Asia. It is a threat which can soon become a threat to the peace of the world.

Mr. President, I deplore the fact that my Government is willing to run the risk of an all-out war in Asia. If China moves in, the war is on. And when we deal with such a despicable, desperate man as the Communist tyrant who rules China today, it is a risk that we cannot justify running unless we have exhausted every possible procedure of international law to avoid a war in southeast Asia.

Many do not like to hear me say it. But it happens to be the ugly fact. The sad fact is that the course of conduct of the United States in southeast Asia these many months past is a course of conduct that adds up only to a deliberate risking of war in southeast Asia and all of Asia.

I again utter my prayer that my country will go to the conference table. The way to meet the strategy of President de Gaulle on yesterday is for us to accept, not a four-nation conference—for I know of no reason under existing international law why the United States, France, Russia, and Red China should decide to go to a four-nation conference table over southeast Asia—but the juris-

16334

diction of the United Nations. All the world has a stake in the conflict in southeast Asia. I would like to see the one organization that represents the Charter of the United Nations proceed to take jurisdiction over this threat to the peace of the world. If not other country is willing to lay it before the United Nations, I would have my Nation lay it before the United Nations and see to what extent the peaceful procedures of international law might establish peace in southeast Asia and bring this ugly and dangerous risk of a full-scale war in Asia to an end. That has been my position for many months past.

I congratulate the leaders of my Government for repudiating the statements of the military heads of the Government of South Vietnam, such as General Khanh and his air force commander, about proceeding to escalate and expand the war into North Vietnam. Our country should serve notice now, particularly in view of the press conference of President de Gaulle on yesterday, that our counter to that press conference is that we shall lay the matter before the United Nations to see if anything can be accomplished through peaceful procedure to bring about peace and stop the continual threat of a full-scale war in southeast Asia.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV RELATING TO JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 338) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MISSISSIPPI CRIME RATE LOWEST IN NATION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in view of certain reckless charges from certain sources which have been made recently, I point out that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has just released its annual report on crime in the United States for the year 1963. The State of Mississippi, according to the FBI report, has the lowest crime rate of any State in the Nation.

The crime rate in the United States in 1963 was 1,198.3 serious crimes per

100,000 inhabitants. It is tragic that this was a 9-percent increase in the national crime rate over 1962 and represents a 12-percent increase over the average for the past 3 years.

The FBI report of serious crimes in the Nation includes murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny where \$50 or more is involved, and auto theft.

According to the FBI report, the nationwide crime rate is almost three times as large as the crime rate in Mississippi. Mississippi's crime rate has consistently been among the lowest in the Nation. The crime rate in Mississippi has been reduced in each of the past 3 years, while that of the Nation has been increased. The crime rate for the Nation, and for Mississippi, for the past 3 years, is as follows:

Nationwide: 1961, 1052.8 offenses per 100,000 inhabitants; 1962, 1102.3 offenses per 100,000 inhabitants (6 percent increase); 1963, 1198.3 offenses per 100,000 inhabitants (10 percent increase).

Mississippi: 1961, 460.9 offenses per 100,000 inhabitants; 1962, 446.4 offenses per 100,000 inhabitants (3.1 percent decrease); 1963, 393.2 offenses per 100,000 inhabitants (10.2 percent decrease).

The comparisons which I make are not a reflection on any other State. There is too much crime everywhere. I wish the national average was as low as the Mississippi average, and I wish all the crime rate everywhere could be seriously reduced. I do point out that the rate of serious crimes in Mississippi is the lowest in the Nation, with 393.2 offenses per 100,000 inhabitants.

Doubtless, many newspaper columnists, editorial writers, and radio and television announcers and commentators will be greatly surprised to learn the true facts about the low crime rate in Mississippi. Unfortunately, in recent months, there has been entirely too much false propaganda filling the newspapers and airwaves of the Nation concerning Mississippi. There has apparently been a determined and dedicated effort to issue a blanket indictment of Mississippi as an area of lawlessness.

But the cold, hard record is otherwise. Mississippi has the lowest crime rate in the Nation. It is high time for the correction of the false propaganda and misconceptions which have gone out over the country. The facts contained in the FBI report repudiate this misleading and erroneous picture of Mississippi painted by some of the Nation's newspaper editors and radio and television networks.

Actually, Mississippi has the lowest crime rate in the Nation, as verified by the FBI report.

Recently, it has been demonstrated that explosive trouble can occur in any area of the Nation. The reign of terror which has been going on in the city of New York in recent weeks and months is a good example. The trouble in Harlem over the past few days shows that there are problems everywhere.

But it is also clear that the solution of the problems, particularly those brought on by racial differences, can only be found through the efforts of local citizens, with local control and local adjust-

ments. These problems are not capable of solution by placing them in the hands of the Federal Government or under some rigid Federal formula. Insofar as law enforcement is concerned, it is clear that law enforcement must be left in the hands of local authorities.

UNITED STATES-CUBA RELATIONS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to add another brief chapter to my continuing plea for hardheaded representation of American interests in the shifting currents of the cold war.

Several weeks ago, on the eve of U.S. trade negotiations with Rumania, I urged in this Chamber that the United States should seek to exact, as its price for trade concessions, the release of political prisoners held by the Rumanian Government.

My reason for taking this position was simply my conviction that we must not abandon principle in our haste to take advantage of opportunities presented by changing circumstances within the Communist bloc. We must make clear that however warm the East-West thaw may get, we will never be satisfied until the essential tyranny of the Communist system is irrevocably modified to take account of human values—personal liberty and freedom of choice not only in political and economic matters, but in every realm of human activity.

In the case of Rumania, it seemed to me that our Government was afforded an excellent opportunity to exert diplomatic leverage along these lines. By making our economic friendship conditional upon humanitarian reform, we could not only make our intentions clear but we might, to some extent, be able to influence the course of events.

Although there was no mention of humanitarian reform in the official communiqué of those negotiations, I understand that my suggestions were taken into consideration. And, subsequently, the Rumanian Government has made public announcement of a new partial amnesty and of its intention to release virtually all political prisoners by mid-August of this year.

I invite attention today to a somewhat similar set of circumstances which seems to be developing in the case of Cuba. I refer specifically to an article entitled "Raul Castro Says Cuba Is Ready To Join United States at Bargaining Table," in the Washington Post of July 22, and to a very excellent article by Richard Eder entitled "Castro Proposes To Halt Aid to Latin Rebels," which appeared in the New York Times of July 6, and also to editorials entitled "Castro's Overture" in the New York Times of July 8 and "Castro's Bid Warrants Further Review," from the Providence Journal of July 7. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the articles to which I have referred make it clear that Fidel Castro has had enough of the